



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/648,512	08/26/2003	Friedhelm Hildebrandt	UM-08333	5258
23535 7590 05/03/2007 MEDLEN & CARROLL, LLP 101 HOWARD STREET SUITE 350 SAN FRANCISCO, CA 94105			EXAMINER GRUN, JAMES LESLIE	
			ART UNIT 1641	PAPER NUMBER
			MAIL DATE 05/03/2007	DELIVERY MODE PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Office Action Summary	Application No. 10/648,512	Applicant(s) HILDEBRANDT ET AL.	
	Examiner James L. Grun	Art Unit 1641	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 07 February 2007.
- 2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1,4,6-8,21 and 22 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1,4,6-8,21 and 22 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
- * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- | | |
|--|---|
| 1) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application |
| 3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____ | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____ |

Art Unit: 1641

The amendment filed 07 February 2007 is acknowledged and has been entered. Claims 2, 3, 5, and 9-20 have been cancelled. Claims 1, 4, 6, 7, 8, 21, and 22 remain in the case.

The following is a quotation of the first paragraph of 35 U.S.C. § 112:

The specification shall contain a written description of the invention, and of the manner and process of making and using it, in such full, clear, concise, and exact terms as to enable any person skilled in the art to which it pertains, or with which it is most nearly connected, to make and use the same and shall set forth the best mode contemplated by the inventor of carrying out his invention.

The specification is objected to under 35 U.S.C. § 112, first paragraph, as failing to provide an adequate written description of the invention, and failing to adequately teach how to make and/or use the invention, i.e. failing to provide an enabling disclosure.

The specification is objected to and claims 1, 4, 6, 7, 8, 21, and 22 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 112, first paragraph, for the reasons of record that the specification contains subject matter which was not described in such a way as to reasonably convey to one skilled in the relevant art that the inventor(s), at the time the application was filed, had possession of the claimed invention, and which was not described in such a way as to enable one skilled in the art to which it pertains, or with which it is most nearly connected, to make and/or use the invention. As set forth, applicant fails to describe or enable the predictable presence of the intact polypeptide in any sample of the unknown cells which may express the polypeptide, applicant fails to specifically identify, and fails to provide antibodies specific for, any epitope of the polypeptide, or any other means, which predictably can be used to discriminatingly detect a truncated version in patients versus normals, particularly specific truncations as are now claimed, applicant does not describe nor provide guidance for the performance of a gel free truncation test

Art Unit: 1641

with a sample from a subject comprising polypeptide. As set forth, absent further written description and guidance from applicant, one would have no assurance of the ability to identify relevant samples, to identify, make and use relevant reagents, and to predictably perform the invention as instantly claimed. As set forth, a patent is granted for a completed invention.

Applicant's arguments filed 07 February 2007 have been fully considered but they are not deemed to be persuasive.

Notwithstanding applicant's assertions to the contrary, applicant's amendments to a "tissue sample" have not obviated rejections under this statute for the reasons of record and as set forth above. For the reasons of record, applicant provides no description or guidance to relevant tissues or reagents that would allow one to predictably perform the invention as instantly claimed.

Applicant urges that the generic disclosure of making and using antibodies would allow one to understand the nature of the invention and how to perform the claimed method. This is not found persuasive because the skilled artisan cannot envision the detailed chemical structure of the encompassed genus of antibodies or other detection means and therefore conception is not achieved until reduction to practice has occurred, regardless of the complexity or simplicity of the method of isolation. Adequate written description requires more than a mere statement that a molecule is part of the invention and a reference to a potential method of isolating it. The molecule itself is required. See *Fiers v. Revel*, 25 USPQ2d 1601 at 1606 (CAFC 1993) and *Amgen Inc. v. Chugai Pharmaceutical Co. Ltd.*, 18 USPQ2d 1016. Furthermore, in *The Regents of the University of California v. Eli Lilly* (43 USPQ2d 1398-1412), the court held that a generic statement which defines a genus of molecules by only their functional activity does not

Art Unit: 1641

provide an adequate written description of the genus. The court indicated that although applicants are not required to disclose every species encompassed by a genus, the description of a genus is achieved by the recitation of a representative number of molecules falling within the scope of the claimed genus. In the instant case, applicant has not described even a single functional species that predictably can be used to discriminatingly detect one or more particular truncated variant polypeptides in (undefined) patient samples from that encoded by the *NPHP4* genomic sequence in normals, as are now claimed. Moreover, note that an enabling disclosure for the preparation and use of only a few analogs of a product, or none as in the instant application, does not enable all possible analogs where the characteristics of the analogs are unpredictable. Amgen Inc. v. Chugai Pharmaceutical Co. Ltd. (18 USPQ 2d 1027 (CAFC 1991)).

Applicant urges that the disclosure describes how to perform a gel free truncation test. This is not found persuasive for the reasons of record that the specification does not describe nor provide guidance for the performance of a gel free truncation test with any sample comprising polypeptide.

The following is a quotation of the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall conclude with one or more claims particularly pointing out and distinctly claiming the subject matter which the applicant regards as his invention.

Claims 1, 4, 6, 7, 8, 21, and 22 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention.

Art Unit: 1641

In claim 1 and claims dependent thereupon, “the” presence or absence lack antecedent basis.

In claims 8 and 21, the property of “differential antibody binding” is not clear because it is not clear what binding is compared to determine a difference and one of ordinary skill in the art would not be reasonably apprised of the scope of the invention. In claim 21, it is not clear how binding to two epitopes indicates a differential.

In claim 21, recitations of C-terminal portion or N-terminal portion are not clear as to what the antibodies are binding.

In claim 22, the relationships of the components of the method are not clear because the use of a gel free truncation test to detect polypeptide in a sample is not clear.

Applicant's arguments filed 07 February 2007 have been fully considered but they are not deemed to be persuasive.

Notwithstanding applicant's assertions to the contrary, applicant's original disclosure and amendments have not obviated rejections under this statute for the reasons set forth above.

Moreover, although the claims are interpreted in light of the specification, limitations from the specification are not read into the claims. See *In re Van Geuns*, 988 F.2d 1181, 26 USPQ2d 1057 (Fed. Cir. 1993). See also *In re Zletz*, 893 F.2d 319, 321-22, 13 USPQ2d 1320, 1322 (Fed. Cir. 1989) (“During patent examination the pending claims must be interpreted as broadly as their terms reasonably allow.... The reason is simply that during patent prosecution when claims can be amended, ambiguities should be recognized, scope and breadth of language explored, and clarification imposed.... An essential purpose of patent examination is to fashion claims that

Art Unit: 1641

are precise, clear, correct, and unambiguous. Only in this way can uncertainties of claim scope be removed, as much as possible, during the administrative process.”).

Applicant’s amendments have obviated the prior rejection under 35 U.S.C. § 102(a) over Mollet et al. (Nature Genet. 32: 300, Oct. 2000).

The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure.

Mollet et al. (Nature Genet. 32: 300, Oct. 2000) detected a variant of instant SEQ ID NO: 2 in human embryonic kidney cell lysate samples with an antibody. The detected polypeptide comprised a N-terminal truncation of the sequence as instantly disclosed as nephroretinin.

Ishikawa et al. (DNA Res. 5: 169, 1998) disclose the sequence of the cDNA clone KIAA0673 encoding a large protein, which, in light of the instant disclosure and that of Mollet et al. is at least a variant of nephroretinin/nephrocystin-4.

Applicant's amendment necessitated the new ground(s) of rejection presented in this Office action. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL**. See MPEP § 706.07(a). Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR § 1.136(a).

Art Unit: 1641

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY TO THIS FINAL ACTION IS SET TO EXPIRE **THREE MONTHS** FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS ACTION. IN THE EVENT A FIRST REPLY IS FILED WITHIN **TWO MONTHS** OF THE MAILING DATE OF THIS FINAL ACTION AND THE ADVISORY ACTION IS NOT MAILED UNTIL AFTER THE END OF THE **THREE-MONTH** SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD, THEN THE SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD WILL EXPIRE ON THE DATE THE ADVISORY ACTION IS MAILED, AND ANY EXTENSION FEE PURSUANT TO 37 C.F.R. § 1.136(a) WILL BE CALCULATED FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THE ADVISORY ACTION. IN NO EVENT WILL THE STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY EXPIRE LATER THAN **SIX MONTHS** FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS FINAL ACTION.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to James L. Grun, Ph.D., whose telephone number is (571) 272-0821. The examiner can normally be reached on weekdays from 9 a.m. to 5 p.m.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Long Le, SPE, can be contacted at (571) 272-0823.

The phone number for official facsimile transmitted communications to TC 1600, Group 1640, is (571) 273-8300.

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application, or requests to supply missing elements from Office communications, should be directed to the Group receptionist whose telephone number is (571) 272-1600.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

J 22

James L. Grun, Ph.D.
April 20, 2007

Long Le

LONG V. LE 07/27/07
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 1600